

## REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application, and the indication that claims 2-7 contain allowable subject matter. The Office Action, however, tentatively rejected claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,999,058 to Yano. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

Claim 1 is the only independent claim in this application, and claim 1 recites:

1. A liquid crystal display, comprising:
  - a power device;
  - a display unit array;
  - a scan driver, coupled to the power device, outputting a plurality of scan signals to the display unit array, wherein the scan driver sequentially outputs the scan signals to the display unit array in normal operation of the liquid crystal display, and the scan driver outputs an erase signal and all the scan signals during shutdown and power on processes of the liquid crystal display;*
  - a selection device having a first input terminal coupled to the power device, a first output terminal coupled to the scan driver, a second output terminal, and a first control terminal, wherein when the first control terminal receives the erase signal, and the selection device couples the first input terminal to the second output terminal; and
  - a current limiting device, coupled between the second output terminal and the scan driver, limiting instantaneous current from the power device when the scan driver simultaneously outputs all the scan signals.

(*Emphasis added.*) Claim 1 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose the features emphasized above.

Specifically, Yano does not teach, disclose or suggest a scan driver outputting an erase signal and scan signals during shutdown and power on processes of a liquid crystal display. As specifically defined by independent claim 1, the liquid crystal display comprises “a scan driver, coupled to the power device.....”. This is neither disclosed nor suggested in Yano.

In section 2, the Office Action states: “Regarding Claim 1, Yano et al teaches a liquid crystal display, comprising:.....; a scan driver (120 in fig. 3B), coupled to the power device.....”

However, in col. 5, lines 35-49, Yano instead teaches:

“FIG. 3B is a circuit diagram showing the constitution of a scan driver power circuit 120 for driving a liquid crystal display device.....Reference character 132 denotes a scan drive voltage for driving the scan drive circuit of the liquid crystal display device.”

Accordingly, the reference character 120 of Yano denotes a scan driver power circuit which provides the scan drive voltage 132 to the scan drive circuit of the liquid crystal display device. Importantly, the reference character 120 does not denote a scan drive circuit.

Further, Yano does teach operations of a scan drive circuit in a normal operation or during shutdown and power on process of the liquid crystal display device. Specifically Yano does teach a scan drive circuit which sequentially outputs scan signals to a display array in a normal operation of the liquid crystal display device and outputs an erase signal and all the scan signals during shutdown and power on process of the liquid crystal display device.

In contrast, claim 1 clearly defines a scan driver sequentially outputting the scan signals to the display unit array in normal operation of the liquid crystal display and outputting an erase signal and all the scan signals during shutdown and power on processes of the liquid crystal display.

**Yano does not teach, disclose or suggest a selection device coupling a first input terminal of the selection device to a second input terminal thereof when a first control terminal thereof receives an erase signal. As specifically defined by independent claim 1, the liquid crystal display comprises “a selection device having a first input terminal.....”. At least this defining feature is not disclosed in Yano.** For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

In addition, the Office Action further alleges: “Regarding Claim 1, Yano et al teaches a liquid crystal display, comprising:.....; and a current limiting device (102 in fig. 3A; col.4, line

43- Col., line 65),.....” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In col. 4, lines 57-59, Yano actually states:

“A terminal of the resistor 102 is connected to a junction 106 that is connected to an input power supply 101.”

Accordingly, the resistor 102 is connected to the input power supply 101 at the junction 106. According to Figs. 3A and 3B of Yano, there is no device between the input power supply 101 and the resistor 102. Yano also does not teach a selection device which has a first input terminal coupled to the input power supply 101, a first output terminal coupled to the scan drive circuit, a second output terminal coupled to the resistor 102, and a first control terminal and couples the first input terminal to the second output terminal when the first control terminal receives an erase signal, as defined by independent claim 1.

In contrast, claim 1 clearly defines a selection device having a first input terminal coupled to the power device, a first output terminal coupled to the scan driver, a second output terminal, and a first control terminal, and the selection device couples the first input terminal to the second output terminal when the first control terminal receives an erase signal. Further, the second output terminal is coupled to a current limiting device.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 patently defines over the cited art, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Insofar as claim 1 is allowable, claims 2-8, which all depend from claim 1, are also allowable on their own merits in claiming additional elements not included in claim 1.

### **Conclusion**


For the reasons as described above, Applicant believes that claims 1-8 are allowable in their present form. Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims are respectfully

requested. Applicant has made every effort to place the present application in condition for allowance. It is therefore earnestly requested that the present application, as a whole, receive favorable consideration and that all of the claims be allowed in their present form.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this submission. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel R. McClure  
Registration No. 38,962

**Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP**  
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW  
Suite 1750  
Atlanta, GA 30339  
770-933-9500